DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 557 CS 212 514

AUTHOR Willig, Judith B.
TITLE Using Instruction in Sentence Combining To Improve Syntactic Maturity in Student Writing.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 50p.; M.S. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 10; Grammar; High Schools; *Sentence Combining; Sentences; Sentence Structure; Writing Attitudes; *Writing Exercises; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Writing Development

ABSTRACT

A practicum provided 10th- grade students in 2 English honors classes with direct instruction in sentence combining. The goal of the program was to increase the syntactic complexity of student writing, to have students express more in each sentence. Instruction was approached from different aspects. The students worked with two textbooks on sentence combining. They worked with sentences from the newspaper and a magazine. There were lessons in sentence combining as a means to understanding the style of the two textbook authors. Sentence combining was used as a means to encourage substantial revision of essays. Writing an abstract of the research paper was approached through sentence combining. Exercises utilizing different levels of thinking were also included. According to a pretest and posttest measured by T-unit length, students progressed an average of four years during a 10-week period. The attitudes of the students toward writing generally improved. (Sixteen references and a bibliography are attached. Appendixes include: a letter from the language arts supervisor, a "T.V. Guide" exercise, an essay on sentence combining strategies keyed to Bloom's learning behaviors, a pretest and posttest, and test results.) (Author/MG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233557

"USING INSTRUCTION IN SENTENCE COMBINING TO IMPROVE SYNTACTIC MATURITY IN STUDENT WRITING"

BY

JUDITH B. WILLIG

A Practicum Report
submitted to the Faculty of the Center for the Advancement of Education of Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

The abstract of this report may be placed in the School Practices Information Files for reference.

August/1985

CS212514

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith B. Willig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

I hereby testify that this paper and the work it reports are entirely my own. Where it has been necessary to draw from the work of others, published or unpublished, I have acknowledged such work in accordance with accepted scholarly and editorial practice. I give this testimony freely, out of respect for the scholarship of other workers in the field and in the hope that my own work, presented here, will earn similar respect.

ABSTRACT

Using Instruction in Sentence Combining to Increase Syntactic Maturity in Student Writing.
Willig, Judith B., Practicum Report, Nova University, Center for the Advancement of Education
Descriptors: Writing (Composition)/Writing Instructions/ Sentences/Sentence Combining/Grammar/Writing Exercises/ Writing Skills

Tenth grade students in two English Honors classes were given direct instruction in sentence combining. The goal of the program was to increase the syntactic complexity of student writing, to have them express more in each sentence.

Instruction was approached from different aspects. The students worked with two textbooks on sentence combining. They worked with sentences from the newspaper and a magazine. There were lessons in sentence combining as a means to understanding the style of two authors. Sentence combining was used as a means to encourage substantial revision of essays. Writing an abstract of the research paper was approached through sentence combining. Exercises utilizing different levels of thinking were also included. According to a pre-test and post-test measured by T-unit length, students progressed an average of four years during a ten week period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TITLE PAGE	i
AUTHORSHIP STATEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
OBSERVER'S VERIFICATION	v
CHAPTER	
I PURPOSE	1
II RESEARCH	5
III METHOD	11
IV RESULTS	19
V RECOMMENDATIONS	22
REFERENCE LIST	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	30
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: LETTER FROM LANGUAGE ARTS SUPERVISOR	33
APPENDIX B: T.V. GUIDE EXERCISE	34
APPENDIX C: SENTENCE COMBINING KEYED TO BLOOM'S LEARNING BEHAVIORS	36
APPENDIX D: PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST	43
APPENDIX E: TEST RESULTS	44

NOVA UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314

AUG 26 1985

OBSERVER VERIFICATION FORM

Verification of Practicum Activity

Dear Observer:

Practicum students in Nova's M.S. and Ed.S. programs are asked to provide external verification that the project activities reported in their final practicum documents took place as described. You have been designated an observer to fulfill this confirmation function by the student named below. On this sheet, then, please write a note attesting to your knowledge of the project activity described in the final practicum report to which this will be attached. (Note that you are not asked to evaluate, or make judgments about the quality of the project.)

Since Mrs. Willig and I plan together each day, it has been easy to observe her curriculum planning. She has been teaching sentence combining activities each week and has even shared some with me. This, of course, is in accordance with the implementation plan.

Practicum Title Using Instruction in Sentence Combining To Improve Syntactic Maturity in Student Writing

Student's Name Judith B. Willig

Program Site Miami Date June 19, 1985

Observer's Name JEAN N. LEWIS Jean N. Lewis
(please print ----------and sign)

Observer's position English Teacher

PURPOSE

Students for many years have not demonstrated writing skills at a level which met with the approval of educators or the public at large. This problem, and a possible solution, emerged into the public eye with the passage of the "Jack Gordon Writing Skills Act" (1982) into law. So acute did the legislature perceive the problem to be, that it provided funds for additional senior high English teachers in order that none would teach more than 100 students. In most schools, English teachers are also given a second planning period. In return for this consideration, these teachers are required to assign and grade at least one major piece of writing each week.

While the law remains general in its requirements, the directives which have followed are quite specific, to wit: students' work most show evidence of the writing process, including pre-writing and re-writing activities. Auditing teams actually check students' folders for the required number of properly executed essays. In the researcher's school, each English teacher must turn in twenty student folders each grading period for the assistant

principal to scrutinize. By the end of the first semester, two required and five optional writing workshops had been held in the school as a reaction to the perceived lack of quality in the students' writing and to the teachers need for instruction in how to teach writing.

The target population is a group of tenth grade students in two honors English classes. The student population of this senior high school is 60% White, 20% Black, and 20% Hispanic. There is no noticeable ethnic conflict. These students come from homes that are primarily middle and lower middle class. A large percentage are from one-parent homes. Many of the students hold part-time jobs. However, in the two classes to be examined in this study, the make-up differs somewhat from that of the school at large. The ethnic mix is 62% White, 14% Black, 18% Hispanic, and 6% Other. Most of these students are from two-parent, middle class homes. Very few of these students hold jobs; however, the majority spend a large amount of time in extra-curricular activities.

Because of the recommendation of the 1983-1984 Honors Audit Committee that more students be included in the

honors program, the number of tenth grade honors English classes was increased from two to four, with a resultant dip in the performance level of these students. This committee also found reason to criticize the honors writing program and the students' compositions. The problem was even more acute this year with the addition of so many lower level students. As a new honors teacher, this researcher was expected to incorporate new ideas and methods into the program.

Included in the appendices is a letter from the Supervisor of Language Arts in Dade County attesting to the need for different approaches to teaching writing and to the existence of a problem with student writing (see Appendix A). The problem seemed so multifaceted, the researcher felt it would be more profitable to choose one aspect of student writing and improve that aspect rather than attacking it as one insuperable task.

Over a period of ten weeks, the students in the target group were expected to improve the syntactic maturity in their writing by at least two grade levels. Because growth

in syntactic complexity proceeds at such a glacial pace, improvement equal to two years progress is not as overly ambitious as it might seem. Since the average rate of growth is less than one extra word per year, a projected growth of two words is equal to over two years' progress. The students were also expected to express more positive attitudes toward the writing process.

RESEARCH

Legislation and directives, which instruct teachers to focus primarily on the writing process, do not guarantee that even the most conscientious teacher will succeed in improving the writing of his or her students. English teachers have always considered instruction in writing as one of their duties; however, the means to do so effectively were not as apparent as the desirability of this goal. Since most teachers are trained only in how to judge student writing, the emphasis has been on the end product rather than on the actual writing process.

An investigation into the teaching of the writing process in other high schools reveals that the teachers trying "new" methods are doing substantially the same things: clustering (a type of brain-storming), several revisions of papers, peer response groups, "mapping" (another form of clustering), and logging of errors. These methods have also been employed by the researcher with some degree of success.

The researcher has examined the methods used in the past. The most widely and frequently used method of writing instruction has been the teaching of traditional grammar. The rationale for this instruction has been that it would teach the principles of error avoidance, and that it would encourage the production of mature language, by presenting for emulation the full range of sentence structure (Mellon,1969). Students were taught to correct errors and to cite the rules for doing so. They also labeled parts of sentences or diagrammed them. A series of studies in the 1930's, beginning with Symonds (1931) demonstrated that the overt learning of rules was less successful than even oral drills in "right" and "wrong" forms.

In a more modern study conducted by Harris (1962) and described by Mellon (1969), the number of errors in compositions written by two groups of students were compared before and after one of the groups had undertaken a two year study of traditional grammar. Both groups showed no reduction in the number of errors. Harris

also analyzed the writing according to eleven "criteria of maturing style". These, too, showed no improvement wrought by instruction in traditional grammar; the students were primarily concerned with error avoidance.

Bradock(1963), in a review of the effect of formal grammar on writing, stated that it had either a negligible effect or a harmful effect, because it took the place of practice in actual composition. Research by Bateman and Zidonis (1964) supported this conclusion with methods more scientific than those of the thirties. This later study claims that a knowledge of generative grammar did help students to write well-formed, more complex sentences. Mellon (1969) suggests that the sentence combining practice in the study, rather than the grammar taught, produced what he considers the most important result, an increase in syntactic complexity. He points out that the range of sentence types and longer independent clauses, the use of more subordination, and the more heavily and deeply embedded sentence occurs as the student matures; therefore, syntactic

complexity can be equated with syntactic maturity. However, this growth, because it is not taught, may not be optimal. In fact the growth of syntactic fluency is so slow, that studies by Hunt (1964) and Harris (1962) reveal that the changes from one year to the next may not have statistical significance.

Mellon's study, based on the idea that syntactic maturity means the ability to say more with every sentence, sought to achieve twice the normal rate of growth, as measured by Hunt, for ninth grade students. The results of his study show two to three years growth in a five month program.

O'Hare (1971) went a step farther than Mellon and eliminated all grammar terminology. He used seventh graders and tried to prove that the normal rate of growth of syntactic maturity could be accelerated through direct instruction in sentence combining alone. He states that because sentence combining is simple and non-error oriented, students should find it easy and interesting. His success would seem to support this

assertion: the experimental group experienced growth in syntactic maturity five times as great as the group in Mellon's study.

Combs (1976), in a similar five month study, also found that instruction in sentence combining produced significant gains in syntactic maturity. McKee (1982) conducted a study at a university over an eight week period. He found that the group which studied sentence combining increased their syntactic maturity and decreased their errors, while the group instructed in traditional grammar sustained losses in error-free writing, as they tried to use more complex forms. Ryan (1980) gave a high level twelfth grade composition class and a general twelfth grade English class some exercises in sentence combining. The students then wrote various sentences and paragraphs from the exercises. The composition class produced superior exercises. The general class, especially those students with severe writing problems, produced the best writing they had ever done in that class.

The researcher decided upon instruction in sentence combining as a strategy for improving student writing because studies of this nature abound, the majority strongly supporting this approach. There were also political considerations. The curriculum of the honors class could be deviated from only if the teacher chose to do something which was acceptable to her superiors. Sentence combining had had enough publicity to make it a favorable idea to those in charge. Because it had not yet been used in this school, there was some eagerness on the part of the assistant principal and the department head that someone pioneer the use of this technique.

The time involved in the teaching of sentence combining, while considerable, would not take too much time from the tenth grade program. A number of the exercises could be used in conjunction with the literature and writing program already in progress. The cost was not substantial; many of the materials were created by the teacher and xeroxed for use in the classroom.

METHOD

Implementation took place over a ten week period. During this period the course demanded that students work on their required literary and composition assignments as well as on the sentence combining activities. Each week a somewhat different sentence combining activity was attempted. Both the assistant principal for curriculum and the language arts department head at the researcher's school approved the project, contingent upon the course requirements being met.

In week one, the students were introduced to the concept of sentence combining. Exercises from the book Building English Skills: Sentence Combining (Horst and Rosenberger, 1981) were used. Because the book is very elementary, few examples from each chapter were utilized. The methods discussed and practiced were as follows: joining equal ideas; combining sentences by adding single words; adding groups of words; combining sentences by substitution; combining to show who, which, that, when, and where; combining to show relationships. The students spent

one class period on these. They were given a handout outlining all of these to be used in subsequent work on sentence combining.

During week two, the students worked with exercises from Sentence Combining: a Composing Book (Strong, 1983). Students began at the second level of difficulty, which the author refers to as phase two. The selections used are entitled "Beauty Queen," "Mellomint Patty," and "A Means to Meaning." In these, a series of kernel sentences are presented, each two of which the students worked on independently. Some of them then wrote their combined sentences on the blackboard. Then all compared their various results. The teacher pointed out a major lesson to be learned during all sentence combining activities is that there are many correct ways to turn the kernels into sentences. The students next wrote an essay based on "A Means to Meaning," a selection about the writing process itself.

During week three the students worked with a type of writing which they encounter during their everyday lives.

They were given kernels derived from T.V. Guide descriptions (see Appendix B). The teacher showed them what the originals looked like in the magazine. They were given a homework assignment requiring each to bring in at least three samples of T.V. program descriptions which they had clipped from their newspapers. The teacher collected these and chose one example from each student's paper. This example was divided into kernels. The process was time-consuming in as much as the teacher did not use any sample more than once; it necessitated writing kernels for fifty different program descriptions. The kernels were given to the students in class the following day. These, they had to combine into one sentence. The clippings originally submitted were returned so that they might compare them with their own efforts. Some of the students then read aloud both versions.

In week four the students worked with the novel they were reading, John Steinbeck's The Grapes of Wrath. The teacher gave them copies of kernels which she had derived from passages in the novel. The students, without

reference to the book, combined the sentences. They read aloud their various efforts and compared them. The teacher gave the pages on which the passages could be found and the students compared their sentences with those of Steinbeck's.This method is invaluable as a means of exploring a writer's style. For instance, the students discovered on their own the author's extensive use of compound sentences, rather than just having the teacher point this out.

In week five the students moved up to phase three in the Strong book. They worked with the selections "Morning Showers" (which was their favorite for the entire unit), "Magic Words" and the "Invitation to Writing" which follows "Departure." At this point they were combining many more kernels into one sentence. Students were placed in groups of three to work on these exercises. One member of each group read the resultant sentences and they were thus able to compare those of each group. This once again stressed that there are many ways to say the same thing.

During week six the students used sentence combining

while taking a test on their outside reading. The class as a whole had been reading George Orwell's 1984 and Ayn Rand's Anthem, both anti-utopian or utopian novels. They were to read on their own an anti-utopian or utopian novel. For the test the students had to compose, in kernel form, ten good questions about their books. Next they had to write the answers to the questions, also in kernel form. They then had to turn these kernels into a short essay about the book read.

In week seven the class attempted to use sentence combining in the revision process. Since it is often difficult to get students to do a major revision, teachers need to come up with new ways to help students revise something other than their basic mechanical errors. Using a means suggested in part by Mellon (1981), the teacher gave each student an essay written by a fellow student. The students each chose one paragraph that especially needed expansion. They then wrote the additional information in kernel form. The essays were returned to their authors, who had to combine the kernels into sentences. This is a method that

might be employed by them in the future as a relatively painless way of beginning substantial revision. This exercise is especially important because it literally forces the student to do a true revision, and hopefully, to see the improvement they can make.

During week eight the students were typing, at home, the research papers they had just finished writing. They were required to write in kernel form a description of what they had learned during the research they had just completed. They combined these kernels into sentences. They each read the results to the class, thus enabling all the students to share in the knowledge they had gained. They were then told they had written an abstract of their papers.

In week nine students continued working within the framework of Bloom's Taxonomy using methods suggested by Burke (see Appendix C). The students began at level two, comprehension, during the first week when they worked at recognizing the form and purpose of grammatical elements in sentence combining. When the Strong exercises were per-

formed with the manipulation of grammatical elements in different ways, the students were working at level three, application. When the students compared their different sentences with those of other students and those written by Steinbeck, they were operating at level four, analysis. During week nine the students used synthesis, which is level five. The teacher gave them sentences from descriptive passages in Ernest Hemingway's Farewell to Arms which they had just studied. They used these passages to construct sentence combining activities for each other. These consisted primarily in their writing kernels from the passages for the other students to combine. They learned an interesting fact here; contrary to the myth, Hemingway does not write all short sentences; he writes many very long, involved sentences. The students did not reach the sixth level, evaluation.

In week ten the students returned to the Strong book for phase four. They worked with a selection entitled "Final Exam." The students worked on these exercises in their peer groups. The groups wrote their versions on the

blackboard. Finally as a psychological preparation for their own impending exams, they wrote on the "Invitation to Writing" which follows the selection.

Some of the activities which had been planned were not feasible. Originally a "read-a-book-in-an-hour" lesson was scheduled. However the elementary type of literature necessary for this activity seemed a waste of time with the resultant loss of exposure to important literature to be studied. The exercises in the Strong book met with positive reaction on the part of the students, with the result that the researcher used more than had been originally planned.

RESULTS

The researcher evaluated the outcome of this experiment. The instruments used were a pre-test and post-test, both measured by mean T-unit length. Measuring the improvement of syntactic complexity has been tried a number of ways. Hunt (1965) originated the term T-unit; it is one main clause and any subordinate clauses attached to the main clause. Because a T-unit can be lengthened by either lengthening the clauses or increasing the number of subordinate clauses, determining the mean T-unit length measures any increase in syntactic complexity. While there are a number of ways that T-unit information can be compiled, T-unit length is the most accurate and least time-consuming. (O'Donnell, 1975).

The students in both classes were assigned an essay. They wrote about the relative importance of three values (see Appendix D). Because argumentative writing shows more changes in syntactic fluency than narrative or descriptive writing (Crowhurst, 1978), the essays assigned

were argumentative. The essay was to be written "to the most intelligent person the student knows." This was to encourage them to write in their most mature manner. The essays were required to be a minimum of four hundred words. This number is the shortest possible length for a valid measurement of syntactic maturity using T-unit length (O'Hare, 1971). The post-test was the identical assignment, using the same pictures and instructions. Ten students were selected: one A student, four B students, four C students, one D student. (Originally the selection was to include three A students, three B students, two C students, and two D students; however, by the end of the year only one student had an A average and one, a D average. Therefore the proportions had to be changed.) The essays were judged for mean T-unit length. Since the average growth per year has been less than one word per T-unit (Hunt, 1970) the researcher felt that a gain of two words per T-unit over a ten week period would be most satisfactory.

The students achieved greater improvement than the

researcher had predicted. The average improvement was 3.91 words per T-unit. This is a growth of more than four years in a ten week period. Only one student suffered actual regression according to the pre-test and post-test; this C student wrote .42 fewer words per T-unit. The greatest progress was achieved by a B student who had an average T-unit increase of 9.67 words (see Appendix E).

The attitudes of the students towards writing generally improved. The lessons were well-received by the majority of both classes. When the teacher announced the improvement made by the classes as measured by the tests, both classes cheered.

RECOMMENDATION

Both the department head of language arts and the assistant principal for curriculum have been so pleased with the results of the experiment and the positive comments of many of the students involved that they have ordered a class set of the Strong book to be used in all the English 10 Honors classes during the 1985-1986 school year. Also under consideration is the sequel, a book by Strong which deals with paragraphs, for use in the English 11 Honors classes. Sentence combining will become a required activity in these classes.

Some of the teachers of the regular level English classes have also expressed much interest in sentence combining. They too may wish to include sentence combining as a regular part of their curriculum. The researcher has agreed to create and supply them with materials to get them started. There is a strong possibility that the researcher will give some workshops for those teachers. If the teaching of sentence combining is adopted as a

regular part of the curriculum by the majority of the English teachers at this school, it will probably become a required part of the curriculum by the 1986-1987 school year.

The researcher intends to make sentence combining a regular part of her curriculum, both in the English 10 Honors and English 11 classes. Rather than teaching this for a limited amount of time, the researcher will begin the instruction the second week of school and continue teaching sentence combining throughout the year. In all probability the regular classes will proceed at a slower pace, and not reach as high a level of development, but they should definitely show progress in the syntactic maturity of their writing by the end of the year. The honors classes, given an entire year to work with this skill, should achieve great progress with their syntactic complexity by the end of the school year.

There is also a strong possibility that instruction in sentence combining will be used in other schools in the county. The researcher had agreed, before implementation

of the practicum had begun, that she would send all materials to various colleagues in other high schools upon the successful completion of the experiment. These teachers are very eager to try out the various methods employed this year. Since the researcher will supply them with the materials and handouts, they are especially likely to include instruction in sentence combining in their course of study.

The Supervisor of Language Arts in this county has requested that the researcher and a colleague conduct two workshops, in sentence combining. These will be presented on August 28, on the teacher's planning day when all the language arts teachers in the county attend a meeting at one high school. The workshops along with the handouts which will be provided to those in attendance, should encourage the use of instruction in sentence combining.

The researcher plans to be available for any other workshops on sentence combining during the year. The Project Manager for Language Arts in this county has already indicated that there will probably be a demand for this type of workshop throughout the year.

It is suggested that teachers interested in using

instruction in sentence combining attend any of the workshops available. They should also read the vast amount of literature available on this subject, much of it suggesting different means of teaching sentence combining.

Sentence combining can be used at most grade levels. In the junior high school, the teacher would do well to utilize the Horst and Rosenberger book. The senior high teacher might begin with the easiest level (phase one) of the Strong book. The pace at which the class should proceed can be determined by the individual teacher. It is also suggested that the teacher who successfully attempts new methods of instruction in sentence combining, share it via workshops with his or her colleagues.

References

Bateman D.R., & Zindonis, F.J. The effect of a knowledge of generative grammar upon the growth of language complexity. The Ohio State University U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project, 1964, 1746.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. Research in written composition. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1963.

Combs, W.E. Further effects of sentence combining practice on writing ability. Research in the Teaching of English. 1976, 10, 137-149.

Crowhurst, M. The effect of audience and mode of discourse on the syntactic complexity of written composition at two grade levels. London, Ontario: Canadian Educational Researchers Association, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 157 068).

Florida State Law, Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, 198?.

Horst, W. H., & Rosenberger, D. A. Building English skills: sentence combining. Evanston: McDougal, Littell and Co., 1981.

Hunt, K. W. Grammatical structures written at three grade levels: the structures to be analyzed by transformational methods. U.S. Office of Educational Cooperative Research Project, 1964, 1998.

Hunt, K. W. Grammatical structures written at three grade levels. No. 3 in a Series of Reports Sponsored by the National Committee on Research. Urbana, Illinois: 1965.

McKee, M. B. Sentence combining--not if or when, but how. Conference Paper from the Illinois TESOL Annual Convention, 198?, 10. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 350).

Mellon, J. C. Transformational sentence combining. NCTE *One in a Series of Research Reports*, 1969, 10.

Mellon, J. C. Can sentence combining play a role in the revision process? *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the NCTE*, 1981, 71. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 979)

O'Donnell, R. C. A comparison of two indices of syntactic complexity. *Studies in Language Education Report*, 1975, 20. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 685)

O'Hare, F. Sentence combining--improving student writing without formal grammar instruction. *No. 15 in a Series of Research Reports* Sponsored by the National Committee on Research. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1971.

Ryan, J. H. Sentence combining--from the textbook to the classroom. *Paper Presented at the Annual*

Meeting of the NCTE, 1980, 70. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 036)

Smith, C. F. Read a book in an hour--variations. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association Great Lakes Regional Conference, 1978, 3. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 163 426)

Strong, W. Sentence combining: a composing book. New York: Random House, 1983.

Symonds, P. M. Practice versus grammar in the learning of correct English usage. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1931, 22, 81-95.

Bibliography

Braun, C. & Klassen, B. A transformational analysis of written structures of children representing varying ethnic-linguistic communities. Research in the Teaching of English, 1973, 7, 312-323.

Brown, J. A. Concepts, kernels, and compositions. South Atlantic Bulletin, 1970, 35, 41-45.

Campbell, D. T., and Stanley, J. C. 1968. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1968.

Jensen, J. M. A comparative investigation of the casual and careful oral language styles of average and superior fifth grade boys and girls. Research in the Teaching of English, 1973, 7, 338-350.

Loban, W. Language development: kindergarten through grade twelve. Research Report No. 18. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1976.

McCrimmon, J. M. 1969. Will the new rhetorics produce new emphasis in the composition class? College Composition and Communication, 1969, 20, 124-130.

Meckel, H. C. Research on teaching composition and literature. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.

Miller, G. A. The magic number seven, plus or minus two. Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 81-97.

Penfield, E. F. Revision revisited. Exercise Exchange, 1978, 2, 19-22.

Postman, N. Linguistics and the pursuit of relevance. English Journal, 1967, 56, 1160-1165.

Prater, D.L., & Mayo, N.B. Cognitive development level and syntactic maturity. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1984, 17, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service EJ No. 988 893)

Seegers, J.C. Form of discourse and sentence structure.

Elementary English Review, 1933, 10, 51-54.

Stalnaker, J.M. The construction and results of a twelve-hour test in English composition. School and Society, 1934, 39, 218-224.

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1450 NORTHEAST SECOND AVENUE
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132
(305) 376-1449

DR. LEONARD BRITTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

PAUL W. BELL
ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT
BUREAU OF EDUCATION

DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
MR. PAUL L. CEJAS, CHAIRMAN
MR. ROBERT RENICK, VICE-CHAIRMAN
MR. G. HOLMES BRADDOCK
DR. MICHAEL KROP
DR. KATHLEEN B. MAGRATH
MS. JANET R. McALILEY
MR. WILLIAM H. TURNER

February 1, 1985

To Whom It May Concern:

The need for new approaches to language study is always with us. Now, with the National emphasis on writing and the identification in national reports of writing problems, the need seems greater than ever. Sentence combining seems to be a new approach developed and field tested in the last decade. It teaches grammar and syntax through actual manipulation of sentence parts, and it encourages language production.

Some of the evidence presented by Dr. Frank O'Hare and Dr. William Strong suggests that it is one of the few approaches to grammar that positively affects composition. We are encouraging our teachers to explore its possibilities, create appropriate exercises, and try using some of the existing commercial texts that we have reviewed. Ms. Willig's investigation of the topic and materials could be of significant assistance to other teachers and would be very helpful to me and those of us, like me, who are providing inservice from school to school.

Sincerely,

Zelda Glazer

Zelda Glazer, Supervisor
Language Arts

ZG:mmm

English SENTENCE COMBINING

You are a writer for T.V. Guide. Below are program descriptions in short sentence groupings. Combine each grouping into one sentence. Compare "your" sentence with that of the professional's.

Scarecrow and Mrs. King

Amanda fears for the life.
She has a life.
She witnesses an appearance.
The appearance is by an ex-spy.
The sppearance is on a show.
The show is for talking.
The show is on television. (T.V.)
The ex-spy is bitter.
The ex-spy is plotting revenge against the Agency.

Three's a Crowd

Jack hopes something.
He reunites the parents with a dinner.
The plan meets with disaster.
Vicky has parents.
The parents are divorced.
The dinner is romantic.
The dinner is for two.

TURN OVER FOR "CORRECT" WORK.

"SCARECROW & MRS. KING"/AMANDA & LEE FACE NEW DANGERS! am

Scarecrow And Mrs. King Amanda fears for her life after she witnesses an appearance on a TV talk show by a bitter ex-spy plotting revenge against the Agency. Guest stars: Arlene Francis, Steve Eastin.

Three's A Crowd Jack hopes to reunite Vicky's divorced parents with a romantic dinner for two, but his plan meets with disaster.

Appendix C

Robert Burke

1984 FCTE Fall Conference

October 20, 1984

SENTENCE COMBINING-KEYED TO BLOOMS'S LEARNING BEHAVIORS

If given the proper learning situations, students can enjoy, realize, and control the responsibility that they own in a truly student-centered language arts curriculum. In some of the more static programs, it's so easy and seemingly natural for teachers to teach isolated bits of grammar-by-the-book rules to passive learners who will respond (perhaps?) by identifying grammatical elements out of context after numbering their papers 1-10 (or 20)?

For the acquisition and continual growth of language skills, students must demonstrate learning behaviors which lead to the proper manipulation of grammatical elements. To facilitate student-owned

manipulative skills, sentence combining strategies that enable students to compose varieties of syntactically mature sentences can be used within curriculums based on traditional grammar study.

With the scope of a program provided to teachers by curriculum authority at the district level, sentence combining strategies, based on traditional content, can be presented sequentially at cognitive levels using Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives as the foundation in composing assorted forms of sentence combining problems.

By using the taxonomy to formulate sentence combining problems, the teacher provides to students opportunities to exhibit learning behaviors which develop critical thinking in a sequential and cumulative system of classification organized around six major levels which range from the simplest to most

complex thought processes.

KNOWLEDGE-memory, simple recall

COMPREHENSION-understanding

APPLICATION-solving of simulated topics requiring identification of the problem and the choice and utilization of the relevant generalizations and skills

ANALYSIS-solving of problems with an understanding of the thinking skills needed to solve the problem

SYNTHESIS-solving a problem to which there was no prior clear pattern or structure

EVALUATION-judgment according to the standards set by the learner

--------Bloom, pages 201-207----------

That Bloom's taxonomy has provided a way to observe and measure mental activities in learners relates well

to the thinking operations which are required for solving sentence combining problems. The complex reasoning which students display when combining sentences allows for the physical and mental manipulations of grammatical elements that are synthesized into patterned words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs---all of which grow into essays which ultimately provide students with the ownership of syntactic judgments:

KNOWLEDGE

-----Students will identify grammatical elements around which sentence combining strategies are based.

-----Students will identify usage terms around which sentence combining is based.

COMPREHENSION

-----Students will recognize form and purpose of grammatical elements within sentence combining context.

-----Students will recognize form and purpose of usage patterns within sentence combining context.

APPLICATION

-----Given sentence combining models students will manipulate grammatical elements in a variety of ways as to discover patterns of development.

-----Given sentence combining models students will manipulate grammatical in a variety of ways as to discover appropriate usage patterns.

ANALYSIS

-----Given signals only students will manipulate by sentence combining grammatical elements in a variety of ways as to discover patterns of development.

-----Given signals only students will manipulate by sentence combining grammatical elements in a

variety of ways as to discover appropriate usage patterns.

SYNTHESIS

-----Given no signals students will manipulate by sentence combining grammatical elements in a variety of ways as to construct syntactically mature sentences.

-----Given no signals students will manipulate by sentence combining grammatical elements in a variety of ways as to construct syntactically mature sentences employing correct usage.

-----Given syntactically mature sentences students will construct their own sentence combining problems and provide their own signals for solutions.

EVALUATION

-----Students will determine through options which

grammatical elements are appropriate to the style and tone required for the writer's purpose and audience.

-----Students will edit and proof writing by determining through options which grammatical elements and/or usage patterns can be used to make appropriate revisions.

Appendix D

Pre-test and Post-test

Look at pictures A,B,C. Each of these people obviously live a different lifestyle. Think about which lifestyle would be the best and why. Now write an essay of at least 400 words in which you convince the smartest person you know that the most important requirement for happiness is A) wealth, B) love, or C) fame. Remember that not only will a highly intelligent person judge you by the arguments you give, but also by how bright you seem to be by the evidence of intelligence you give in your style and expression in writing.

Appendix E

TEST RESULTS

STUDENTS	PRE-TEST: MEAN WORDS PER T-UNIT	POST-TEST: MEAN WORDS PER T-UNIT	DIFFERENCE	PROGRESS 10 YEARS (APPROXIMATE)
A	14.90	19.68	4.78	5
B	14.13	15.06	.93	1
	13.20	16.25	3.05	3
	9.34	14.20	4.86	5
	11.77	21.45	9.68	10
C	11.83	11.41	-.42	-.50
	10.92	11.60	.68	.75
	11.17	14.75	3.58	3.70
	12.63	16.29	3.67	3.75
D	9.98	17.82	7.84	8

AVERAGE INCREASE IN MEAN WORDS PER T-UNIT: 3.91

AVERAGE PROGRESS IN YEARS (APPROXIMATE): 4